REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for informalities due to a lack of a brief description of Figure 4. This has been corrected by amendments to the specification above. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-4 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Spohn et al. (JP 411296333A).

Spohn teaches dividing one document up into several subsets of pages, or multiple copies of a single document, referred to as print segments, and then transmits each segment to a selected printer in individual messages. See the translation at paragraph 22. This increases the network traffic. Further, as the messages are sent individually, no routing information is embedded in the print job. The address of the printer is not in the print job, but as part of the single message. As the messages in Spohn are point-to-point messages, not routing information would be included.

In contrast, the instant invention divides up the copies of a document to be created and transmits one message addressed to multiple addresses of printing devices, where the routing information embedded in the print job routes the message to the appropriate addresses on the network. By having the host only transmit one message, albeit to multiple addresses, it reduces the amount of traffic on the network.

Claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended to more clearly show that the embedded information is routing information and that the print job is only transmitted once. As discussed above, this is not shown, taught nor suggested by Spohn. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 10 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Docket No. 8371-105   Page 6 of 8   Application No. 09/618,867

PAGE 8/10 * RCVD AT 5/27/2004 1:43:34 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5032744622 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44

With regard to claims 2, 3, 4, 17 and 18, Spohn does not disclose that the host is a printer or application software running on the printer. A printer is shown in Figure 4, but the text clearly states that the host is a computer. See Spohn, paragraph 21, "...was generated by the network computer 12." Spohn does not show that the host is a printer, or that the host is application software running on a printer. Spohn does discuss a host being a computer, but it is not a host computer that embeds routing information into a print job, nor one that only sends the print job in one transmission. It is therefore submitted that claims 2, 3, 4, 17 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 9, Spohn does not teach that the transmission of the print job is sent to a store-and-forward device. As discussed in Spohn, the print server of the prior art is the device that generates the print job. See Spohn, paragraph 6. Spohn actually teaches away from the use of a print server. See Spohn, paragraph 8. It is therefore submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claims is requested.

With regard to claims 11-15, Spohn does not disclose that the computer readable medium of claim 10 has code on it that causes the device to embed routing information into a print job, nor that the print job is sent in one transmission. Therefore, Spohn does not teach the further limitations as to the form of the computer readable medium as claimed in claims 11-15. It is therefore submitted that claims 11-15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 19, Spohn does note disclose a network device of claim 16, where the processor of the network device is operable to embed routing information into a print job that is sent in one transmission, much less that the process is a raster image processor. It is therefore submitted that claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spohn et al. and in view of Yokoyama (US Patent No. 6,166,826).

Spohn does not disclose that the host can be anything other than a computer. Therefore, even though Yokoyama generally teaches a multifunction peripheral, there is no suggestion in the combination that the host be an MFP, with scanner and fax functions. Regardless, the combination of references does not teach a method in which a host embeds routing information in the print job and then transmits the print job in one transmission. It is therefore submitted that claims 5-8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, PC
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613
Customer No. 20575

Docket No. 8371-105   Page 8 of 8   Application No. 09/618,867

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 5/27/2004 1:43:34 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5032744622 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44